

PROPER ROMAN NAMES IN OFFICIAL GREEK-LANGUAGE ROMAN DOCUMENTS: UNVEILING THE IDENTITY OF THE TRANSLATORS

Mattia CAPPONI

PhD student in Ancient History
University of Pavia / University of Haute-Alsace
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici / UMR 7044 Archimède

RÉSUMÉ

LES NOMS PROPRES ROMAINS DANS LES DOCUMENTS OFFICIELS LATINS TRADUITS EN GREC : UNE CLÉ POUR L'IDENTIFICATION DES TRADUCTEURS ?

Cet article étudie la transcription grecque des noms propres romains dans les documents officiels romains rédigés en grec pendant la période républicaine. À travers une analyse linguistique détaillée des inscriptions du II^e et I^{er} siècle av. J.-C., l'étude examine les caractéristiques phono-orthographiques qui apparaissent dans les transcriptions grecques des noms propres latins. Bien que l'orthographe de ces noms ne relève pas toujours d'une transcription strictement phonétique, on peut relever des cas de transgraphémisation, dans lesquels certains traits peuvent être interprétés comme des indices du background linguistique des traducteurs. En confrontant ces phénomènes linguistiques aux données historiques relatives au personnel administratif romain, l'article soutient que les traductions ont très probablement été réalisées par des *scribae* attachés à l'*aerarium Saturni*, dont beaucoup étaient originaires de l'Italie centrale et méridionale. L'étude renforce cette hypothèse par l'analyse des choix lexicaux effectués dans la traduction grecque des termes institutionnels romains.

MOTS-CLÉS

Noms propres,
traductions,
documents officiels,
administration romaine,
scribae.

This article investigates the Greek rendering of proper roman names within the Greek-language Roman official documents produced during the Republican period. Through a detailed linguistic analysis of inscriptions from the second and first century BCE, the study explores the phono-orthographic features that emerge in the Greek transcriptions of Latin proper names. Even though the spellings of the names are not always phonetically transcribed, we can find cases of transgraphemization, in which some features can be interpreted as traces of the translators' linguistic background. By comparing these linguistic phenomena with historical data on the Roman administrative personnel, the article argues that the translations were most likely executed by *scribae* attached to the *aerarium Saturni*, many of whom originated from central and southern Italy. The study further supports this claim by examining lexical choices in the translation of Roman institutional terms into Greek.

KEYWORDS

Proper names,
translations,
official documents,
roman administration,
scribae.

FROM ROME TO THE EAST: THE TRANSLATION OF ROMAN OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

The Roman empire, by virtue of its expansion across culturally and linguistically different territories, was a truly multilingual world [1]. Latin was of course the official language of imperial administration, but Greek played a central role in the linguistic system of the Empire. Long before Roman rule, Greek had already established itself as the *lingua franca* of the Eastern Mediterranean [2]. Greek was the language of culture and communication, and it remained far more widely spoken than Latin, which never fully supplanted it in these domains [3].

A direct consequence of the linguistic predominance of Greek in the *pars Orientis* was the necessity for Rome to provide translations of official acts when addressing Greek-speaking communities. For the Republican period, over a hundred Roman documents in Greek have survived—mostly *senatus consulta* and letters from magistrates, but also laws, decrees, and treaties between Rome and various Greek cities [4]. Notably, we often possess only the Greek versions of these documents.

Unfortunately, no ancient source explicitly identifies the persons or institutions responsible for the translation of the official documents into Greek. It is by now well established that such translations were produced in Rome [5]. The style of the translation (often slavishly reproducing the original Latin form), together with the

recurrence of arbitrary and standardized vocabulary choices across documents differing in type and date, suggests that the translation was carried out in Rome by qualified personnel [6]. More specifically, Sherk has argued, in the introduction to his monumental collection of official documents in Greek, that this translation work was done within the *aerarium Saturni*, Rome's state treasury and archive, and not at the same time with the drafting of the official Latin text. This can be inferred from a variety of factors, from the archiving and validation procedures for official documents to the limited technical expertise of Roman magistrates in Roman legislation (cf. *infra*).

One may consider first the process by which a document was drafted and subsequently acquired legal validity. Consider the case of the *senatus consulta*. After each meeting of the Senate, a small committee of senators drafted the official wording of any *senatus consultum*. Based on memory or brief notes, they prepared the formal text, which the *relator* alone was authorized to deposit in the state archives. This deposit (*delatio ad aerarium*) was essential, since only after registration in the archives, in the presence of witnesses, did the decree acquire legal validity [7]. In the archives, the decree was received by the *quaestores urbani*, who entered it into the public records (*in tabulas publicas relatio*). It was only at this point that the text acquired full legal validity and could, when necessary, be extracted for translation, either to be dispatched to the East or to be furnished to Greek embassies requesting a Greek version for display

[1] The considerations presented here will be discussed at greater length in the author's doctoral thesis. All abbreviations are indicated according to the form prescribed by the AIEGL – Association Internationale d'Épigraphie Grecque et Latine (<https://www.aiegl.org/grepiabbr.html>).

[2] Here *lingua franca* should be understood as the common language between people who lacked a shared first language (Chirikba 2008, p. 38).

[3] In effect, both Latin and Greek coexisted within a complex sociolinguistic system in which, albeit to different extents and with diachronic variation, they shared functions at both high and low levels of social life. In this sense, Corbier 2008, p. 32 speaks of "colinguism". For a detailed perspective on the use of one language or the other in different social contexts, see Adamik 2006. On the topic of Greek-Latin bilingualism, see, above the others, the valuable works of Kaimio 1969, Rochette 1997, Adams 2003, and Mullen 2011.

[4] The most comprehensive collection of the texts in question remains Sherk 1969 (*Roman Documents from the Greek East* = RDGE). However, it is a partial compilation: the author deliberately chose to exclude from the volume epigraphs containing Roman *leges* written in Greek. In addition to this limitation, archaeological excavations conducted over the past sixty years have brought to light new epigraphic material not included in Sherk's work. For the gaps in Sherk's collection and an attempt at updating it, see Famerie 2016.

[5] This hypothesis was first advanced by Viereck 1888, later taken up by Sherk 1969, and is now widely recognized as valid and credible.

[6] For a more in-depth discussion of the issue, see Capponi 2024, p. 157-166.

[7] Cf. Coudry 1989, p. 570. For a more detailed discussion of the archiving system, see Raggi, Buongiorno 2020, p. 121-133.

in their home cities [8]. In effect, official documents could not be removed from the archive, which makes it likely that translations were carried out in situ by the *aerarium*'s own staff [9]. Outsourcing the translation would have required cumbersome and inefficient procedures, such as the extraction, duplication of the documents and external supervision – all of which were incompatible with the functional operation of Roman bureaucracy.

The archive was formally overseen by the *quaestores urbani*, magistrates with largely supervisory duties. The daily operations, however, were managed by subordinate personnel (the *apparitores*) [10]. Considering the technical nature of the documents, which required not only fluency in Greek but also a solid grasp of Roman legal terminology, it is unlikely that the *quaestores* were directly involved in the translation process. As Cicero himself bemoaned, Roman magistrates were often unfamiliar with laws and constitutional principles—he argued that their staffers were more knowledgeable [11]. It is therefore within the *apparitores*—and more precisely among the *scribae*—that we must look for the likely translators of these documents. In effect, among all functionaries of the *aerarium*, the *scribae* were arguably the most competent in legal and administrative matters [12].

The *scribae* belonged to a *decuria* from which, every year in December, the names of those who would assist the magistrates in office were drawn by lot. Depending on their assigned magistrate, scribes were classified as

scribae quaestorii (who assisted the quaestors in the administration of the *aerarium*), *scribae aedilicii*, and *scribae tribunicii* [13]. The *scribae* tended to come from ordinary or low-status backgrounds, even when they were legally freeborn [14]. Republican historiography consistently associates early *scribae* with libertine or socially marginal milieus, as exemplified by figures such as Cn. Flavius, son of a freedman, whose career made the connection between scribal office and low social extraction almost paradigmatic [15]. *Scribae* were organised in an *ordo* (*ordo scribarum*), which indicates that the *scribae* constituted a formally recognised status group within Roman society. As with other ordines, inclusion in this category implied the possession of an honorific civic rank (*gradus dignitatis*), conferring upon its members the quality of being regarded as *digni* [16]. Membership in the *ordo* therefore conferred substantial symbolic and social capital. This combination of modest origins and privileged access to administrative knowledge, financial resources and political networks could generate significant opportunities for social mobility.

The roman *scribae* played a central and highly specialised role in the production, management, and legal validation of official documents. Far from mere copyists, they were directly responsible for the drafting of magistrates' records, and for their subsequent incorporation into the *tabulae publicae*. Their responsibilities included drafting, copying, and archiving official texts, as well as verifying their accuracy and authenticity [17].

[8] On the publication of official documents in Greek in the East, see Cooley 2012. Evidence for the extraction of the text is sometimes indicated in the prefaces of translated *senatus consulta*. In the *senatus consultum de Plarasensibus et Aphrodisiensibus* of 39 BCE, for example, there is a clear reference to the tablets in which the Latin text was preserved and from which it was extracted for translation: [ἐπὶ Γαίου Καλουεισίου Γαίου υἱοῦ, Λευκίου Μαρκίου Λευκίου υἱοῦ ὑπάτων ἐκ τῶν ἀνε[ν]εχθέντων δογμάτων συνκλήτ<ου> δέλτω [?πρώτη κηρώμασι τετάρτω π]εμπτω, ἕκτω, ἑβδόμω, ὀγδόω, ἐνάτω, ταῖς δὲ ταμιακαῖς δέλτοις. "In the consulship of Gaius Calvisius, son of Gaius, and Lucius Marcius, son of Lucius, (copy) from the decrees of the Senate entered in the archive, on the first tablet, pages four, five, six, seven, eight, and nine, and in the quaestors' tablets". (Raggi, Buongiorno 2020).

[9] Cf. Sherck 1969, p. 13-19.

[10] Cf. Millar 1964. On the issue of the *apparitores*, see also David 2019.

[11] Cicero, *Laws*, III, 20, 46: *Legum custodiam nullam habemus; itaque eae leges sunt, quas apparitores nostri volunt [...]. sic animadverto <ple>rosque in magistratibus ignoratione iuris sui tantum sapere quantum apparitores velint*. For the limited legal expertise of Roman magistrates on matters of legislation, see also Schulz 1946, p. 87 and Hartmann 2020, p. 19. The limited expertise of Roman magistrates in legislation supports the view that translation could not have been carried out by the magistrates who,

following the meeting of the Senate, drafted the text to be copied onto the archival tablets.

[12] Cf. *infra*.

[13] We shall not address here the difficult issue of the nomenclature (*scriba* or *scriba librarius*) applied to these officials. The problem arises from the fact that in the epigraphic sources these *apparitores* are sometimes referred to as *scribae* and at other times as *scribae librarii*, and there is no agreement among scholars as to the reason for this differentiation. Purcell maintained that the *scribae librarii* belonged to a category of *apparitores* with a less prestigious social status than that of those who bore the title *scriba* (cf. Purcell 2001). According to David, by contrast, whereas the *scribae* were the *apparitores* who remained within the *decuria* and were on the state's payroll, the *scriba librarius* was a scribe who had originally belonged to a *decuria* but had decided to leave in order to offer his services privately to a magistrate, while nevertheless retaining the title and the status deriving from it (cf. David 2019, p. 96-107). De Maddalena 2014, 135-136, on the other hand, argues that there is no difference between the nomenclature *scriba librarius* and *scriba*, and that the latter was simply an alternative form in which the term *librarius* was implicitly understood.

[14] Cf. Hartmann 2020, p. 112-120.

[15] Cf. Fioretti, p. 339-341; Badian, p. 582-584.

[16] Cf. Hartmann 2020, p. 112.

[17] Cf. Angius 2016, p. 421 and David 2019, p. 62.

There is literary and epigraphic evidence not only of their systematic involvement in judicial documentation but also of cases in which individual *scribae* explicitly claimed juridical expertise. A quaestorian *scriba librarius* described himself as having “lived for lawsuits while remaining personally free from litigation” [18], while a *scriba* attached to the curule aediles went so far as to claim the title of *iuris prudens*, that is, a fully qualified jurist [19]. All these arguments suggest that they possessed the expertise needed to render Latin documents into idiomatic and accurate Greek.

To sum up, the combined evidence of archival procedures, practical constraints, and patterns of professional expertise points to the *aerarium*—and more specifically to its *scribae*—as the institutional locus of the translation activity, rather than to the magistrates involved in drafting the Latin originals. The *scribae* were entrusted with translating all documents archived in the *aerarium* and, with a high degree of probability, the official letters drafted by magistrates in Rome [20].

The question is: is there any additional evidence that might support the identification of the *scribae* as the primary agents of translation? This question leads to the core of my investigation: is it possible to infer some information on the translators by examining the translation of proper Roman names in the Greek versions of official documents? Given the administrative nature of these texts, they are full of personal names of Roman magistrates and officials, rendered into Greek through processes of transcription and adaptation. These translated names, I argue, reveal clues about the linguistic competence and the identity of the translators.

‘TRANSLATING’ PROPER NAMES: A GENERAL OVERVIEW

Proper names are inseparable from the culture and language in which they originate [21]. The name Достоевский (Dostoevsky), for instance, clearly reveals its Russian origin through its Cyrillic script,

phonological structure, and morphological particularity. Likewise, the name Rousseau is immediately recognizable as French for the same reasons. This poses specific challenges for their translation (or more precisely, transfer) into another language.

A proper name—precisely because it emerges from a specific linguistic context—embodies the phonological and orthographic features of language. Therefore, like any other lexical borrowing, in case of translations it carries into the target language the structural characteristics of its language of origin, which are often differently encoded, or entirely absent, in the receiving language. For instance: the name of the Russian collector Shchukin (Щукин, in Russian) is often transcribed into other languages according to the phonological and orthographic conventions of the translators’ language. In French it appears as Chtchoukine, in English as Shchukin. In the first case, the transcription using the grapheme /Ch/ results from the fact that, in French, the phoneme [ʃ] is typically represented by this digraph; the same applies, for the same reasons, for the digraph /Sh/ in English.

This difficulty of adaptation becomes especially apparent in the transposition of Latin names into Greek and vice versa [22]. Although both languages descend from a common Indo-European ancestry and share numerous morphosyntactic features, they differ significantly in their phonemic inventories—each possessing sounds unfamiliar to the other—as well as in their respective writing systems.

When a proper name is transferred from one language to another, the writer may resort to various adaptation strategies. This might be transliteration: the systematic representation of the characters of one writing system by the characters of another, based on graphic correspondence rather than pronunciation (e.g. *IGUR* 350: Ἀντόνιο – *Antonio*). The most common solution, however, is transgraphemization: the process of writing a word in a different writing system, and in doing so aiming to preserve its phonetic value as closely as possible while adapting to the orthographic conventions of the target language system [23]. Adaptation

[18] *CIL* VI 1819: *L. Naevius. L. I. Urbanus scr(iba) libr(arius) quaestorius [...] vixi iudicio sine iudice.*

[19] *CIL* VI 1853: *iuris prudens scr(iba) aed(iliu)m cur(ulium) v(ixit) a(nnis) LIIII m(ensibus) IIII d(iebus) X.*

[20] In many cases, letters written in Rome—that is, letters whose *salutatio* lists as senders both the tribunes of the plebs and the Senate (cf. FERRARY 1988, p. 173, n. 164)—display stylistic and lexical continuity with Greek archival documents. This makes it possible to posit that the translations were carried out by the same group of officials. Cf. Capponi 2024, p. 165–166.

[21] Cf. Biville 2005, p. 209.

[22] In this context, I will deal with the adaptation of proper names exclusively from a linguistic perspective. My analysis concerns the linguistic adaptation of proper names retaining their phonological structure across languages (e.g., *Quintus* = Κοῖντος), excluding instances of structural substitution (e.g. Ἀθηνᾶ = *Minerva*, *Campus Martius* = τὸ πεδῖον τὸ Ἀρεῖον).

[23] Cf. Renzi 1970, p. 267 with some remarks in Baglioni, Tribulato 2015, p. 19.

through transgraphemization does not always involve all linguistic levels. In the vast majority of cases, in fact, the writer is aware of the morphological system of the target language and therefore adapts the name ending accordingly, but applies transgraphemization to the onomastic base of the name. See, for example, the case of Κάτλος – *Catulus* (RDGE 22.3). In the Greek transcription of the Latin name *Catulus*, the translator adapts the Latin name to the Greek morphological system (-us > -ος), while also accounting for the canonical phonetic articulation of the name—namely, the elision of the post-tonic vowel ŭ—which results in the omission of that vowel in the Greek rendering.

'TRANSLATING' PROPER NAMES: ROMAN NAMES IN GREEK

Let us now turn to the analysis of the proper Roman names attested in the Greek translations of official documents[24].

Here, some preliminary remarks are necessary. When Greek cities began to colonize southern Italy—between the 8th and 7th centuries BCE—the Greek language encountered an extremely diverse linguistic landscape. Greek populations started to establish relations with communities speaking Oscan, Umbrian, Faliscan, Etruscan, Messapic, Latin etc. [25]. Clearly, these contacts gave rise to linguistic contact phenomena that are difficult to identify or explain with precision. Evidence from the 6th to the 4th centuries BCE allows us to identify the adoption of Greek terminology into other languages with some certainty [26]; however, it is not possible to determine the degree of bilingualism or multilingualism attained by the various populations at this point. As Adams stated: "As far as concrete evidence for bilingualism is concerned, the early period from, say, the seventh to the fourth centuries BCE is a closed book" [27].

Focusing more specifically on Greek–Latin contact, it is reasonable to assume that instances of linguistic contact certainly began as early as the 7th–6th century BCE,

primarily as a result of commercial contacts, and intensified in the following centuries. In this initial phase, the prestige enjoyed by the Greek language meant that lexical borrowings were made predominantly from Greek into Latin. However, it is only from the 3rd century BCE onwards, along with Rome's expansion into southern Italy, that contacts between Latin and Greek (as well as with other Italic languages) became more intense. In the period that immediately followed the Samnite Wars, Rome embarked on an intensive programme of colonial settlements, which led to the gradual and systematic spread of the Latin language, Roman institutions, and Roman nomenclature system in the south of the Italian peninsula [28]. Diplomatic contacts with Taranto concerning the protection of their respective spheres of maritime influence date back to the early 3rd century BCE [29]. In Sicily, formal relations with Rome were established in the third century BCE, when the Mamertines of Messina appealed to Rome for protection against Carthaginian expansion [30]. As early as the 2nd century BCE, Latin began to be recognized as a language of prestige, as is evident from the case of Cumae, which formally requested permission from Rome to adopt Latin to conduct certain forms of public business [31].

It is therefore between the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE, with the intensification of official contacts between Rome and southern Italy and the East, that Greek-speaking cities and communities began to more frequently engage with Rome's political sphere and, consequently, with Latin nomenclature. As a result, Greek speakers now needed to adapt Roman names to their own linguistic system on a large scale. However, no orthographic standardization had been developed for these names. In this respect, a comparison may be proposed with the case of the island of Delos in the 2nd century BCE. As noted by Rovai, in Delos, Greek orthographic norms did not provide a stable framework for the transcription of Latin names, since no shared orthographic conventions existed before Rome's political expansion in the East. This is evident

[24] A table listing all the *loci* where the various names appear in official Roman documents is provided at the end of this article.

[25] Cf. Zair 2018 for a more in-depth overview of the linguistic situation of the Italian peninsula.

[26] See, by way of example, one of the earliest Latin inscriptions, datable to between the sixth and fourth centuries BCE: *Castorei Podloueique qurois* (CIL I² 2833). The matrix language is Latin, but apart from *-que* the other three words are borrowings from Greek. For further cases of Greek loanwords in other Italic languages, cf. Zair 2018,

p. 138–139. Also cf. Adams 2003, p. 148–150, and Consani 2016.

[27] Adams 2003, p. 112.

[28] Cf. Estarán Tolosa 2025, p. 53–59. Specifically on Roman colonization, cf. Pelgrom, Stek 2014.

[29] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*, XIX, 5–9.

[30] See on this topic Tribulato 2012, p. 297–309.

[31] Livy 40, 43, 1: *Cumanis eo anno petentibus permissum ut publice Latine loquerentur et praeconibus Latine uendendi ius esset*.

from the great variation in the spelling of the Latin *nomina* found in 2nd century Greek inscriptions [32]. A degree of standardization of Latin proper names came only with the spread of Roman official documents in Greek, between the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE [33].

To sum up, between the 3rd and the 2nd century BCE, orthographic standardization for Latin names in Greek had not yet been widely introduced, and Greco-Latin bilingualism was still in a phase of evolution and consolidation. For this reason, the adaptation of Latin names into Greek in Roman official documents of this period up to the 1st century BCE is particularly interesting to analyse, and may yield insights into the orthographic standardization of these names.

We are now in possession of a sizeable corpus of Roman official documents in Greek, issued between the late 3rd and the 1st centuries BCE. I will base my following analysis on the corpus of documents collected in Robert Sherk's *silloge*, which remains the most comprehensive collection of *senatus consulta* and Roman letters preserved in Greek [34] and includes an onomastic index that is particularly valuable for the present study [35].

The present analysis will therefore draw on the documents collected by Sherk (*senatus consulta* and official letters [36]), supplemented by the official documents arbitrarily excluded from his collection, namely official treaties and laws. The analysis will focus primarily on personal names, but will also include the names of Roman tribes. In total, the analysis will therefore encompass almost 50 official documents – predominantly *senatus consulta*, but also laws, treaties of alliance, and official letters of magistrates – dating from 202 BCE to 27 BCE [37], which contain more than 150 different proper Roman names [38].

Two further clarifications should be made at this point. First, with very few exceptions, the documents under consideration survive only in their Greek translations, and the original Latin versions are no longer extant. This makes it impossible to compare the Greek-transcribed names with the original Latin form of the official text. Thus, in a case like Ἀνθέστιος (RDGE 12, 32, 46), for instance, it is difficult to determine whether we are dealing with a transgraphemization of *Antistius* (where the Latin /i/ is rendered with an open [ĕ] sound in Greek) or rather a transliteration of *Antestius* – a Latin variant that may have appeared in the original document [39].

Another point to consider is that, being official documents, it is likely that the Latin originals employed archaising forms of proper names, a well-attested practice in epigraphic documentation [40]. Furthermore, we must acknowledge the differences between Latin and Greek naming conventions. While Greek texts typically avoid abbreviating proper names, in the Latin tradition – especially in official contexts – the praenomen is frequently abbreviated.

a) Partial phono-graphemic correspondence due to orthographic specificities of the Greek language

i) /u/ [ū] > ου

Acūtiūs — Ἀκουτίος, Crūstumina — Κρούστομινά, Fūrius — Φούριος, Iūlius — Ἰούλιος, Iunius — Ἰούνιος, Clapūrnīus — Καλπουρνίος, Mūcius — Μούκιος, Pūpinia — Πουπείνα, Pūrius — Πούριος, Rūbrius — Ρούβριος, Rūfus — Ρούφος

All Greek dialects, starting from the mid-fourth century BCE, began to use the grapheme ου to render the phoneme [ū] [41]. It is therefore unsurprising that, in the transfer from one language to another, the graphic sequence ου was used to represent the Latin long vowel.

[32] Cf. Rovai 2015, p. 171.

[33] Cf. Rovai 2015, p. 170-171.

[34] Sherk 1969.

[35] Sherk 1969, p. 390-392.

[36] All letters for which there is no certainty that they were composed in Rome have been excluded from the corpus (cf. *supra* n. 20).

[37] The present analysis is limited to documents produced in the Republican period. Under Augustus, the state bureaucracy was extensively reorganized; new offices centred on the *princeps* and an early nucleus of the later imperial administrative apparatus emerged. In that context, the translation of official documents was no longer carried out by state *apparitores*, but by court intellectuals and literary figures organised in a semi-official *officium*. Cf. Capponi 2024.

[38] The analysis focuses primarily on personal names, but also includes the names of Roman tribes. I will focus here

only on names that presents differences between the Greek and the Latin orthographic rendering, excluding names with a full phono-graphemic correspondence (e.g. Ἀκίλιος-Acilius). In such cases, the Latin phoneme-grapheme sequence is fully comparable to the Greek one: there is no discrepancy between the pronunciation of the name and the graphic sequence used to represent the same phoneme in the two languages. Only those spellings for which at least one evidence can be found within our corpus of names will be analyzed. A summary table is provided at the end of this article.

[39] Cf. e.g. CIL X 4381.

[40] See e.g. the form *Poplicola* (= *Publicola*) or *Volscis* (= *Volcis*) in the *Fasti Capitolini* (CIL I 1 frgg. VI-VII-VIII-IX, ll. 11, 20) or the form *Duelonai* (= *Bellonae*) in the *senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus* (CIL X 104. l.2).

[41] Sturtevant 1975², p. 45-46.

ii) /u/ [y] > ου

Caluinus — Καλουῖνος, Caluisus — Καλουῖσιος,
Fuluius — Φόλουιος, Caruilius — Καρουλῖος, Seruilius
— Σερουῖλιος, Seruius — Σέρουιος, Ualerius —
Οὐαλέ(α)ριος, Ualgus — Οὐαλγιος, Uarro — Οὐαρρων,
Uelina — Οὐελίνα, Ueturia — Οὐετυρία

Greek did not possess a semivowel corresponding to the Latin sound [y] and therefore lacked a specific grapheme for it. The common practice was to transcribe the sound [y] using the digraph ου [42].

iii) qui/ [kʷi] > κοι

Quintius — Κοινκτιος, Quintus — Κοιντος

As in the case above (ii), here we are also faced with an orthographic variation aimed at compensating for the absence, in the Greek language, of the Latin phonetic sequence [kʷi]. Already by the second century BCE, the use of the graphic sequence -κοι- had become common practice in the transcription of Latin names [43].

iv) /i/ [i] > ει

Afinus — Ἀφεινιος, Gabinus — Γαυεινος, Didus — Δειδιος, Lucilius — Λευκειλιος, Ofentina — Ὀφεντεινα, Papiria — Παπειρία, Piso — Πεισων, Pulpia — Πουπεινία, Sabinus — Σαβεινος, Silius — Σειλιος

In Greek, starting from the fourth century BCE, the first signs of confusion between ει and ι begin to appear [44]. It is possible to deduce that the sound [e:] (close-mid front vowel), originally denoted by the grapheme ει, was being pronounced as [i] from the Hellenistic period onwards [45], leading to inevitable graphic confusion. As highlighted by Gignac, throughout the Roman and Byzantine periods, Greek papyri show frequent alternation between ει and ι in all phonetic contexts [46]. Despite the apparent confusion attested in Greek papyri, Greek inscriptions from the Roman period show a growing tendency to use ει to denote [i] [47].

It should also be noted that Latin too, at least from the second century BCE to the beginning of the Empire, employed the archaizing orthographic practice of using the digraph /ei/ to distinguish the long /i/ from the short one [48]. Hence, in the absence of further data, it is difficult to determine whether in these cases the Greek rendering with the digraph reflects an attempt to reproduce a Latin orthographic practice or a specifically Greek graphic tendency. What is certain is that statistically, the use of the grapheme ει in the transcription of Latin (proper and common) names appears to have been a widespread trend, especially in Rome: in the Greek inscriptions collected by Moretti (IGUR 264-728), Adams identified about 69 instances in which the digraph ει is used instead of ι to indicate a Latin [i], compared to about 29 cases where iota is used directly [49]. It is particularly noteworthy that out of the 69 examples mentioned, 58 appear in proper names, 23 of which are of Latin origin.

v) u/ [ū] > ευ

Lucius — Λευκιος, Lucilius — Λευκειλιος, Lucullus — Λευκόλλος

The adaptation of the names Lucullus and Lucius into Greek as Λευκιος, Λευκόλλος and Λευκειλιος represents the canonical and most widespread form of Greek transcription of these Latin names. The reason behind this graphic choice remains unclear, although several—possibly not mutually exclusive—hypotheses have been proposed. García Domingo suggests interpreting this spelling as an archaizing form based on etymology. According to the Spanish scholar, Latin once featured an ancient diphthong /eu/, attested in inscriptions until the third century BCE, which was later monophthongised into [ū] [50]. Forms such as Λευκιος, Λευκόλλος, and Λευκειλιος should therefore be understood as attempts at archaizing renderings. Dobias-Lalou, on the other hand, argues that this spelling should be traced back to a resemblance with pre-existing Greek anthroponyms (e.g. Λευκιππος, Λευκοθέη), which may have encouraged this graphic adaptation [51].

[42] Threatte, p. 221-222.

[43] Eckinger 1892, p. 122-123.

[44] Threatte 1980, p. 172-198.

[45] Sturtevant 1975², p. 40.

[46] Gignac 1976, p. 189.

[47] Threatte 1980, p. 198-199.

[48] Anderson, Parsons, Nisbet 1979, p. 132-133.

[49] Cf. Adams 2003, p. 48.

[50] García Domingo 1979, p. 57.

[51] Dobias-Lalou 1998.

b) Partial phono-graphemic correspondence due to interference from the writer's phonetic practice

vi) /i/ [ĩ] > ε & /u/ [ũ] > o

Antīstius — Ἀνθέστιος, Appŭleius — Ἀππολήιος, Crustŭmina — Κρυστομίνα, Domītiŭs — Δομέτιος, Fŭlviŭs — Φόλουιος, Lepīdus — Λεπεδός, Lŭcretius — Λοκρέτιος, Lŭtatiŭs — Λοτάτιος, Nŭmisiŭs — Νομίσιος, Postŭmiŭs — Ποστόμιος, Pŭbliŭs — Πόπλιος, Rŭtilius — Ῥοτίλιος, Spŭrius — Σπόριος, Sŭlpiciŭs — Σολπικίος, Tīberiŭs — Τεβέρος

The graphic rendering in Greek of the phonemes [ĩ] and [ũ] with the graphemes /ε/ and /ο/ must be examined in light of the diachronic and diastratic variation that underlies this orthographic fluctuation.

With regard to pre-Classical Latin, some inscriptions show a clear orthographic alternation between /i/ and /e/ as well as /u/ and /o/ such as *consol* (= *consul*) or *fuet* (= *fuit*) [52]. According to Wachter, this suggests that [ĩ] and [ě] were particularly close in pronunciation at this stage, a similarity that gave rise to formal graphic oscillation at a time when Latin had not yet undergone orthographic standardization, with orthographic choices often reflecting local traditions or individual practice rather than distinct phonological oppositions [53]. Väänänen does not share this view. He calls for exercising great caution when using archaic inscriptions as evidence for actual pronunciation. According to Väänänen, the use of /e/ for /i/ and /o/ for /u/ was motivated by the deliberate adoption of an archaizing style. It may accordingly reflect an earlier phonetic stage rather than a mere orthographic fluctuation due to the later short-vowel mergers [54].

What is certain is that in Classical Latin -and following the process of linguistic standardization- the different pronunciations began to be characterized in sociolinguistic terms. In the Classical period, the open pronunciation of [ĩ] as [ě] and of [ũ] as [ǫ], was perceived by Roman intellectuals as a distinctive trait of a rustic speaker. This tendency is documented by Varro and Cicero. The former notes the tendency of

the farm managers (*villici*) to pronounce the noun *villa* as *vella* [55], while the latter highlights Sulpicius's attempt to imitate the pronunciation of Cotta, who, in trying to mimic the language of ancient poets, ended up speaking like the *messores* [56].

During the Imperial age, a confusion in pronunciation between [ĩ] and [e:], as well as between [ũ] and [o:], is well attested. Adams provides several examples from different contexts in which such mergers can be observed. In the Vindolanda tablets [57], in the letters of Claudius Terentianus [58], and in other private documents from the Imperial period [59], there are attestations of the use of the grapheme /e/ in place of /i/, reflecting a merger in the pronunciation of the two vowels. The same applies to the assimilation of the pronunciation of [o:] with [ũ] [60]. This latter pronunciation was common in Late Latin, but still not fully established by the end of the 2nd century AD [61]. The evidence suggests that these mergers occurred far more frequently in specific phonetic and morphological contexts: notably, in unstressed syllables and in word-final position [62].

In light of this evidence, it is difficult to determine with certainty the factors underlying the orthographic peculiarities observed in these Greek renderings of Latin names. They may result from an archaizing stylistic choice or reflect underlying phonetic realities. In the case of names attested in 1st-century inscriptions, it is also possible that they reflect contemporary linguistic tendencies associated with rustic pronunciation.

vii) /ae/ [ε] > αι

Aemilia — Αἰμίλια, Aemilius — Αἰμίλος, Caecilius — Καϊκίλιος, Gnaeus — Γναῖος, Laelius — Λαίλιος, Maenius — Μαῖνιος, Plaetorius — Πλαῖτωριος

It is not easy to establish a single motivation that might have led to the rendering of the Latin /ae/ with the Greek digraph αι. Different possibilities arise: either we are dealing with cases of (archaizing) graphic transliteration, or with phonetic transcriptions.

A first plausible explanation is that the rendering αι represents an already standardized graphic translite-

[52] Cf. *CIL* I² 8-9. It is the epitaph of Scipio Aemilianus, datable to the mid-3rd century BCE.

[53] Cf. Wachter 1987, p. 305-306, 487-488.

[54] Cf. Väänänen 2006, p. 36.

[55] Varro, *On Agriculture*, I, 14-15: *A quo rustici etiam nunc quoque viam veham appellant propter vecturas et vellam, non villam, quo vehunt et unde vehunt.*

[56] Cicero, *De oratore*, III, 46: *Quare Cotta noster, cuius tu illa lata, Sulpici, nonnunquam imitaris ut iota litteram tollas et E plenissimum dicas, non mihi oratores antiquos sed messores videtur imitari.*

[57] Cf. e.g. Adams 1975, p. 20, 23; Adams 2003a, p. 533-535.

[58] Cf. Adams 1977, p. 8-9.

[59] Cf. Adams 2013, p. 52-57.

[60] Cf. Adams 2016, p. 424-425.

[61] Cf. Adams 1977, p. 25.

[62] Cf. Adams 2003a, p. 533-535, who argues that [ĩ] is mainly spelled correctly in stressed position, in hiatus and in the preposition or prefix *in-*.

ration of the Latin diphthong /ae/. In this sense, the choice of the diphthong αι may have been motivated by the fact that Latin /ae/ derives from an archaic /ai/, which began to be written as /ae/ around the late 3rd century BCE or the early 2nd century BCE [63].

A second possibility is that we are dealing here with cases of phonetic transcription, favored by a process of monophthongization common to both languages. Some scholars have contended that, in Greek, the diphthong αι [ae] (< [aj]) may have been phonetically realized as ε(:) from the fourth century BCE already,] [64]. Similarly, we can reconstruct that in Latin the diphthong /ae/ was pronounced as [ε:], but only in specific areas of the peninsula. Varro quotes a passage from Lucilius, in which the author seems to ridicule the monophthongized pronunciation typical of a certain C(a)ecilius, humorously defined as a *pretor (sic) rusticus* [65]. Varro always highlights the difference in the pronunciation of the noun *h(a)edus*: diphthongized in Rome (*haedus*) and monophthongized in other parts of rural Latium (*hedus*) [66]. Evidently, for a late-first century BCE dweller of the city of Rome, the monophthongization of the diphthong /ae/ was typical of speakers from outside of Rome [67]. Documentary evidence confirms the literary data: the archive of the *Sulpicii* at Pompeii has returned a substantial number of documents written by the freedman *C. Novus Eunus*, within which the spelling /e/ for /ae/ seems to be the graphic norm [68]. This clearly confirms that at least in the first half of the first century CE, the diphthong /ae/ in the Campanian area was already pronounced, and rendered graphically, with monophthongization [69]. This innovation was certainly not contemporary with the drafting of the documents but dates back, as highlighted by Adams, to an articulatory trend in the Campanian area that can be traced at least to the late Republican period [70]. This means that Latin speakers

from the Campanian area (who thus pronounced /ae/ as [ε:]) may have resorted to the Greek spelling αι, since in the koinè it represented a graphic alternative for the same spelling.

Solid objections to this view may be raised: if a Latin speaker who realized [ae] as ε might have chosen αι on the assumption that it represented the appropriate Greek spelling for that sound, we might expect αι to be used also in the rendering of Latin names with /e/. However, no such cases are attested in our corpus.

Nevertheless, the rendering of Latin /ae/ with the Greek digraph αι could be the result of the convergence of the two different mechanisms: on the one hand, an established graphic transliteration rooted in archaic orthographic tradition; on the other, phonetic transcription reflecting regional Latin pronunciations shaped by early and locally circumscribed processes of monophthongization.

viii) /i/ [ĩ] > u

Aemilius — Αἰμύλιος, Mīnucius — Μυνύκιος

Here, the rendering of Latin /i/ as Greek u can be explained as the result of a contextual labialization of [ĩ] in a bilabial environment [71]. The consonant /m/, articulated with lip closure, may induce a secondary rounding of the following vowel, so that the Latin [i] was perceived as slightly rounded rather than as a pure front unrounded vowel [72]. This intermediate timbre, which was not phonologized in Latin, could naturally be represented in Greek by u, the grapheme associated with a front rounded vowel. However, it remains unclear at which chronological stage this tendency can be documented with any consistency and in which linguistic or sociolinguistic domains it is more frequent, since the evidence is sparse and largely confined to isolated spellings and occasional

[63] Cf. García Domingo 1979, p. 65 and Penney 2011, p. 225. As already noted above, it is not unusual to encounter archaizing graphic choices in latin inscriptions. Cf. e.g. *aidlis* (= *aedilis*) in *CIL* I² 8-9, l. 4.

[64] Teodorsson 1974, p. 286-289. Tucker 1969, p. 42 already had the same opinion as Teodorsson. Gignac 1976, p. 192-193 adduces examples of confusion between αι and ε predominantly from the 1st century CE onwards, but notes (p. 192, n. 2) that in some Greek dialects (for example at Delphi) monophthongization was already attested since the late 1st century BCE. However, not all scholars maintain that monophthongization occurred so early. Thraette 1980, p. 294, for example, argues that the diphthong αι began to be monophthongized with some frequency only from the 1st century CE onwards.

[65] Varro, *On the Latin language*, VII, 96: *Cecilius <pretor> ne rusticus fiat*.

[66] Varro, *On the Latin language*, V, 97: *in Latio rure hedus, qui in urbe ut in multis A addito haedus*.

[67] Adams 2007, p. 78-88.

[68] *TPSulp* 51, 52, 67, 68. The spelling with /e/ occurs 17 times, compared to only one instance of /ae/.

[69] Adams 2007, p. 73. According to Varro (*On the Latin language* VII, 96), peasants (in *Atellan farces*) called the character *Pappus Mesius* rather than *Maesius* (cf. Adams 2007, p. 154-155), and these rustic characters could only have been Campanian.

[70] Cf. Adams 2013, p. 73. Cf. also Adams 2016, p. 215-216: "it is possible that the constant spelling with e reflects a long-standing feature of the speech of this Campanian region, distinguishing Campanian Latin still at this period from the speech of the city".

[71] García Domingo 1979, p. 54-55.

[72] Sommer 1948, p. 63.

transliterations. The choice of u therefore reflects a perceptual and graphemic approximation strategy.

ix) /au/ [ō] > ω

Aufidius — Ὠφίδιος, **Taurus** — Θῶρος

What we witness in this case is a Greek graphic rendering (ω) that clearly shows a phonetic transcription of the diphthong /au/ following monophthongization into [ō]. This phonetic phenomenon is rather uncommon in Roman linguistic practice. In Rome, the diphthong /au/ continued to be pronounced [au] until the later phases of the Empire [73]. García Domingo has ventured that the graphic rendering of this name could indicate that practice of monophthongization must have spread in Rome already in the Republican times, providing as examples a series of cases such as *olla* (< *aulla*), *coda* (< *cauda*), *sodes* (< *si audes*), *oricula* (< *auricula*), which frequently occur in the colloquial language of the inhabitants of the city of Rome [74]. It should be noted, however, that the cases of monophthongization presented by García Domingo are the result of a very archaic monophthongization, which is limited to these terms only [75]. For all other terms, the diphthong /au/ remained quite stable in the pronunciation of Rome for a long time.

The situation is different in other linguistic areas of the peninsula: in Umbria and other areas of Latium, monophthongization of [au] had occurred quite early [76]. The grammarian Festus testifies that, in the Roman perception of the 1st century BCE, the monophthongization of [au] was considered an articulatory trait typical of *rustici*, suggesting that there must have been rural speech varieties in areas not far from Rome in which the original diphthong was realized as a long monophthong [o] [77]. The earliest attestation of a monophthongized form of a Latin name (*CIL* I 2379: *Pola* < *Paula*) dates to the first half of the second century BCE and was found in ancient *Pisaurum*, in today's Marche.

It is noteworthy that cases of monophthongization

of the diphthong [au] to [o] are also attested in the Greek transcriptions of Latin names in the island of Delos during the 2nd and 1st century BCE. On this island, many negotiatores of Italic origin—especially from Campania—found success in mercantile activities, and the graphic rendering of their names often provides an important indication of their Latin pronunciation [78]. Here, in an early 1st-century BCE bilingual inscription (*I.Rhénée* 243), the Latin name *Saufei* is rendered in Greek as Σωφῆιος [79].

Coming back to our inscriptions, cases like Ὠφίδιος and Θῶρος could therefore be traced back to phonetic transcriptions by translators originating from those areas of Italy where people used to monophthongize the diphthong [80]. Supporting this idea is the fact that the name *Ofidius* is not attested except in a single case of a *titulus sacrus* (*CIL* IX 4371) of an inhabitant of *Amitemum*, in today's Abruzzo, where the name of the offerer (*L. Ofidius* = *Aufidius*) shows the same case of monophthongization [81]. See also, in this regard, the attestation of the name Ὠφίδιος from an inscription in Delos (*I.Délos* 2623). It is true that in this case the rendering with /o/ instead of ω is recorded, but it cannot be denied that this is a transliteration of the Latin name adapted to the Greek writing system yet reflecting a monophthongized pronunciation [82].

x) qui /k^wi/ > ku or kou

Quirina — Κῠρίνα; Κῠρίβα

In Latin, the grapheme /qu/ represents a single voiceless velar stop with secondary labialization [k^w]. Crucially, the element /u/ does not correspond to an independent vowel or glide, but to a brief rounding of the lips accompanying the articulation of the stop itself. Therefore, the Greek renderings of Latin /qu-/ depend primarily on how the Latin stop was perceived in different phonetic environments. As Allen pointed out, the /u/ component of Latin /qu-/ acquires a particular quality when it is followed by a front vowel or in palatalizing contexts, a quality comparable to that

[73] Cf. Adams 2013, p. 81.

[74] Cf. e.g. Cicero, *Letters to his brother Quintus*, II, 14, 4.

[75] Cf. Adams 2013, p. 81: "The diphthongal spelling au persisted throughout Latin, though there are certain words in which it was often changed to o from an early date (e.g. *olla*, *coda*, *plostrum*, *sodes*, *oricula*)". The difference between this early monophthongization and the later one found in the Romance languages can be inferred from the close pronunciation of the /o/ in the aforementioned Latin terms, as opposed to the open pronunciation of /o/ resulting from Romance contraction: *còda* (*codam* < *caudam*) vs. *óro* (< *aurum*).

[76] Vännänen 2006, p. 39.

[77] Festus, *De verborum significatu*, p. 196, 26-28 Lindsay: *Orata genus piscis appellatur a colore auri, quod rustici orum*

dicebant, ut auriculas, oriculas. Cf. Adams 2007, p. 181.

[78] Cf. Adams 2002 and *infra* (point xii for a deeper discussion).

[79] Cf. Rovai 2015, p. 173 and Poccetti 2015, p. 84.

[80] Even Adams, while acknowledging that a tendency toward the monophthongization of the diphthong never became widespread in Latin, nevertheless concedes that "The limited cases of o for au, which as noted above tend to be in rustic words, may reflect contact in some sense between Latin speakers and speakers of Italic languages in which the change had occurred". Cf. Adams 2013, p. 83.

[81] Cf. also *CIL* I² 2055 (centre Italy) which presents the name *Plautus* as *Plotus*.

[82] For further attestations of the monophthongization of the [au] diphthong in Delos, see Poccetti 2015.

of the Greek υ [83]. Thus, spellings like Kupiva reflect the phonetic realization of the Latin labiovelar.

By contrast, the spelling Koupiva for *Quirina* reflects a different perceptual segmentation of the same Latin labiovelar /kʷ/. In some cases, a speaker may have perceived the sequence /qui/ as a clearly distinct sequence of two vowels in hiatus. In this case, the /i/ could be assimilated or absorbed under the influence of the following alveodental consonant, whose place of articulation was very close to that of the vowel itself [84]. In this perspective, koupiva represents a vocalization of the labial element, segmented as [u] and rendered by ou.

xi) Sonorization

Sempronius — Σεμβρώνιος

As Rovai noted, the form Σεμβρώνιος can only be attributed to the voicing of the labial [p] due to the influence of the preceding nasal [85]. This phenomenon was common to Latin and Greek pronunciation, meaning that this attestation does not help us determine the translator's linguistic background [86].

xii) Gemination

Camilia — Καμέλλια/Kαμίλλια, Licinius — Λικίννιος

This case of the gemination of the consonant /n/ and /l/ is open to various possible explanations and makes it difficult to give a single, definitive motivation for the phenomenon. García Domingo explains the graphic doubling as a result of expressive gemination that would occur in Latin when the consonant involved is pronounced with a "grande intensidad" (great intensity) and "el intervalo (es decir, la tensión) entre la implosión y explosión es mayor que el habitual" [87]. However, cases of gemination explained in this way only occur when the length of the vowel preceding the consonant allows for a compensatory lengthening of the latter [88]. In the case of *Camilia* and *Licinius*, the brevity of the vowel /i/ preceding the consonant forces us to look for other explanations. Similar cases of consonant gemination following short vowels are

attested in numerous inscriptions from Delos: *I.Délos* 2248 Στερτέννιος (Stertinius), *I.Délos* 2531 Ὀλόσσηιος (Volusius), and *I.Délos* 2616, 2622 Λικίννιος (Licinius). In these cases, Rovai—and before him Poccetti—has traced the gemination back to an orthographic practice of Oscan origin, indicating palatalization of the consonant [89]. It should be noted that, regarding the specific case of *Licinius*, Rovai expresses some doubts about the possibility of Oscan interference. Unlike other attested cases, such as Ἀύλλιος (*Aulus*) and Ἑρριος (*Herius*)—for which the scholar is confident that the spelling indicates palatalization—Rovai argues that occurrences of this phenomenon in names recorded in official documents, surely translated in Rome, rule out attribution of this rendering to Oscan habits [90]. However, the issue is not so straightforward: as we have already seen above and will further establish below, linguistic phenomena of South Italian origin are not rare in the Greek adaptation of Roman proper names. Therefore, it cannot be excluded, and indeed it is highly probable, that the gemination of the nasal in *Licinius* here reflects a *Sprachbund* practice widespread among speakers in the central and southern Italian area [91].

xiii) simplification of geminates

Stellatina — Στηλατῖνα, Tremellius — Τρημήλιος, Cassius — Κάσιος

It is not easy to determine with certainty what motivation (or motivations) may have led the compilers of these texts to render the geminates of Latin names as single consonants. As argued by Niedermann, until as late as the beginning of the second century BCE it was still common practice among Latin writers to represent double consonants graphically as single consonants. It was in those years that a tendency began to emerge toward the graphic representation of both consonants; however, this new orthographic practice took a long time to stabilize and spread widely [92]. At the same time, we know that in Latin articulatory practice there was a tendency to realize a geminate consonant

[83] Cf. Allen 1970², p. 17 and Threatte 1980, p. 447-448.

[84] García Domingo 1979, p. 73-74.

[85] Rovai 2015, p. 174 (n.31).

[86] Threatte 1980, p. 616.

[87] "The interval (that is, the tension) between implosion and explosion is greater than usual". Cf. García Domingo 1979, p. 81-82.

[88] See Poccetti 2015, p. 105, with reference to the spelling Νόννεις for Nōnius.

[89] Cf. Rovai 2015, p. 176, and Poccetti 2015, p. 84, p. 104. On the palatalization of consonants in the Oscan area, see Pisani 1954 and Orioles 1972.

[90] Rovai 2015, p. 176.

[91] I adopt the definition provided by Romaine, according to which a *Sprachbund* is a shared way of expressing some speaking features that extends across language boundaries. Cf. Romaine 1994, p. 23.

[92] Cf. Niedermann 1953², p. 112.

as a singleton when it occurred immediately after a long vowel or a diphthong [93]. In Greek practice, by contrast, from the Classical period onward it is very unusual to find simple spellings for geminate consonants. There are, however, some cases (in particular the rendering of λλ and σσ as single consonants) of apparent hesitation in the graphic representation [94].

xiv) consonant cluster reduction

Censorinus — Κησωρῖνος, **Clustumina** — Κλυτομίνα

The form Κησωρῖνος should here be understood as a phonetic transcription reflecting an articulatory weakening of the nasal before the sibilant (/ns/ > /s/). Several epigraphic attestations allow this articulatory phenomenon to be regarded as particularly widespread in Latin, at least from the third century BCE onward [95]. Likewise, before the voiceless dental /t/ the [s] tends to be articulated very weakly [96]. This accounts for the form Κλυτομίνα for *Clustumina*.

By contrast, Greek articulatory practice does not display a systematic tendency toward the weakening or loss of consonants in clusters such as νσ and στ, which remain generally stable in both phonetic realization and graphic representation [97].

xv) insertion of a vowel within a consonant cluster

Calpurnius — Καλοπόρνιος

The form Καλοπόρνιος for *Calpurnius* is interpreted by García Domingo as reflecting an implosive articulation of velarized /l/ in preconsonantal position, in forms such as *cauculator* (< *calculator*) [98]. On this account, the Greek rendering would presuppose an intermediate form *Calupurnus*, subsequently adapted as Καλοπορνιος for the phonetic reasons discussed above [99]. However, no epigraphic evidence supports the existence of that form. Alternatively, the form may be explained as the result of anaptyxis, i.e. the insertion of a vowel between contiguous consonants to facilitate articulation. Anaptyctic spellings of this type are attested in the Murecine tablets

(e.g. *ominis*, *octoberes*, *septeberes*) and have been interpreted by Flobert as reflecting an Oscan articulatory tendency [100]. A possible parallel may be found in a Delian inscription (*I.Délos* 2628 3.36), where the name *Ulcus* appears in Greek as Ὀλόκιος (with dots under the first three letters); if the reading is correct, this form would likewise point to an Oscan-type anaptyxis [101]. However, it should be noted that the attribution of this type of anaptyxis specifically to an Oscan influence is not universally accepted: both Adams and Wachter express reservations [102].

xvi) Syncope

Catulus — Κάτλος, **Lentulus** — Λέντλος

The syncope of a short post-tonic vowel is a particularly rare phenomenon in Greek articulatory practice [103]. The few cases in which this phenomenon is attested in Greek are all datable to the period of Roman domination [104]. The most frequent instances involve the reduction of certain suffixes (e.g. -ιος, -ιον, -αιος), a tendency that particularly affects personal names, often under Latin influence. In Latin, by contrast, the same type of syncope is a phenomenon that characterizes the language from its earliest stages [105].

c) Partial correspondence due to specific orthographic choices in the Latin language

xvii) Orthographic archaism

Coelius — Κοίλιος, **Publicius** — Πονλίκιος, **Pūblius** — Πόπλιος

The Greek rendering of the name *Publius*, which loses the voicing of the labial consonant, cannot be attributed to any single linguistic phenomenon specific to either Latin or Greek. As is widely accepted in the literature, this is a case of orthographic archaism: the form Πόπλιος is a deliberate attempt to reproduce the archaizing form of the Latin spelling in Greek [106].

At the same time, the Greek rendering of *Koelius* for *Coelius* is an archaizing graphic form reflecting the ancient diphthong /oi/ (> /oe/) and should like-

[93] Cf. Niedermann 1953², p. 125 and García Domingo 1979, p. 81. Several examples of these same names are attested in Republican Latin inscriptions with single-consonant spellings for geminates; cf. *AE* 1998 423 (*Stelatina*), *CIL* VI 33968 5 (*Tremelius*), *CIL* VI 40897 (*Casius*).

[94] Cf. Threatte 1980, p. 511-527.

[95] Väännänen 2006, p. 64, and Adams 2013, p. 178-182. Cf. e.g. *CIL* I² 8-9 *cosul* (< *consul*) from the mid. 3rd century BCE.

[96] García Domingo 1979, p. 86.

[97] Threatte 1980, p. 569.

[98] García Domingo 1979, p. 84. In any case, the cited examples are very late, dating at least to the third century CE.

[99] Cf. point *vi* in this article.

[100] Flobert 1995, p. 148-149.

[101] Cf. Adams 2003, p. 120 n. 42.

[102] Cf. Wachter 1987, p. 396-401, Adams 2003, p. 120 n. 42, Adams 2016, p. 219-220.

[103] Cf. Threatte 1980, p. 395.

[104] Cf. Threatte 1980, p. 395-406.

[105] Cf. Adams 2013, p. 90.

[106] Threatte 1980, p. 220.

wise be interpreted as an instance of orthographic archaism [107]. This spelling *Coilius* is attested in Republican-period inscriptions [108].

xviii) /a/ [ā] > αα (*geminatio vocalium*)
 Mārcus — Μάρκος, Mārcellus — Μαρκέλλος

In official Republican documents, there is an alternation in the rendering of the name *Marcus* between Μάρκος—with a single α—and Μάρκος—with a double α. This latter form, characterized by gemination of the vowel (*geminatio vocalium*), has attracted considerable interest, and scholars have proposed various explanations for this digraphic rendering, none of which is entirely convincing in my view.

Mommsen tried to explain this form by hypothesizing the existence of an archaic form *Mharcus*, which might have been somehow preserved in the Greek pronunciation. However, the absence of any attestations by ancient grammarians or in inscriptions of such a form makes this hypothesis unlikely [109].

The digraph form can certainly not have resulted from a Greek orthographic convention: there are no recorded cases in Greek where vowel length is indicated by graphical gemination [110].

Similarly, it seems unlikely that the /αα/ (= /aa/) spelling reflects a common writing practice in the city of Rome. The idea that the poet Accius introduced vowel gemination into Roman orthography is now considered a myth. Even if one granted some credibility to this theory, the earliest documented occurrence of the form Μάρκος in official Roman documents dates to 170 BCE, earlier than any possible intervention by Accius on orthography. As Rovai has recently observed, the practice of indicating vowel length by doubling never took hold in Rome [111].

The most plausible hypothesis is that this orthographic choice is a legacy of Oscan stylistic practices. Indeed, in South Italian areas under Oscan influence, using the digraph to indicate vowel length was common practice [112].

A particularly useful comparison is provided by inscriptions found at Delos bearing the names of many Italic *negotiatores*—mostly from Campania. As Adams notes, “it has now become something of a commonplace that the Latin of the Delos inscriptions is the Latin not of the city of Rome, but of Campania” [113]. It follows that the numerous attestations of the name Μάρκος with vowel gemination in these inscriptions can be attributed to the *usus scribendi* of bilingual speakers originating from that part of Italy. I report here, just as an example, the Greek transcription of *M. Pactumeius* (*I.Délos* 1733, 1, 8, c. 125 BCE: *M(arcus) Pactumeius M(arci) f.* / [...] Μάρκος Πακτομήιος Μάρκου). The *Pactumeii* were a wealthy family of Campanian merchants. Another example is *I.Délos* 1730, 5 (c. 125 BCE): Μάρκος Γράνιος Μάρκου [...] *M. Granii M. f.* The *Granii* were also a merchant family from Pozzuoli.

In Latin, attestations of the praenomen with gemination are very rare and all relate to speakers from South Italian areas. This is the case with an honorary inscription offered by a group of Italic *negotiators*, probably of Campanian origin, to *Q. Maarcium*: *CIL* III 532 (Argos, 67 BCE): *Q(uintum) Maarcium Q(uinti) [f(ilium) Regem] / Italicei quei ne/gotian[tur Argeis]*.

In Italian territory, vowel gemination of the name *Marcus* is attested in inscriptions from regions influenced by the Oscan language [114].

The linguistic analysis of the Greek transposition of Roman proper names provides insight into the complex system of compromises involved in the transition from one language to another. In many cases, it is difficult to determine whether the adaptation—and therefore the translation of the document—was made by a Greek or a Latin speaker. Cases such as those analysed in sections i, ii, iii, iv, v, vii, viii, x, xi, xiii, xvii do not allow for any definitive inference in this regard: the adaptation of the name could have been made either by a Greek speaker applying his own phonological and orthographic conventions, or by a Latin speaker with sufficient proficiency to be familiar with Greek orthographic norms [115].

[107] Cf. García Domingo 1979, p. 67.

[108] Cf. e.g. *AE* 1997 195, *CIL* I² 3303.

[109] Eckinger 1893, p. 8–11.

[110] Threatte 1980, p. 136–137.

[111] Rovai 2023, p. 212.

[112] Cf. e.g. *CIL* I 1529 *Vaurus* (< *Varus*), *CIL* I 1605 *Paapus* (< *Papus*) and many others recorded by Lazzeroni 1956.

[113] Adams 2002, p. 117.

[114] See the name *Maarcus* in *CIL* I² 1202, which is comparable with the Oscan form *Maak-*. Cf. Vine 1993, p. 277.

[115] Although, as noted in section iv, the use of the spelling ει to represent [i] and the vocal syncope in proper names appear to have been favoured by Latin speakers more than Greek ones.

More informative in this respect are proper names that, in their Greek rendering, retain traces of either the articulatory habits or the *usus scribendi* of the translator. In many instances (point vi, xiv and xvi), the transcription of proper Roman names clearly reveals features that have been widely attested across Latin-speaking regions. What is most striking, however, is the recurrence in several cases (point ix, xii, xviii, and with some uncertainty, vii and xv) of orthographic or phonetic practices that can be linked to a specific area of the Italian peninsula: namely, Latium and Campania.

DID SCRIBAE MAKE THE TRANSLATIONS? SOME COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE LINGUISTIC AND THE HISTORICAL DATA

Let us return, then, to the initial question: how does this data support the hypothesis that official Roman documents were being translated by *scribae* in the service of the Roman *aerarium*?

For the Republican age, the geographical profile of the Roman *scribae* can only be reconstructed in a fragmentary and strictly prosopographical manner. Republican evidence is anecdotal, selective and ideologically biased, whereas the epigraphic documentation becomes abundant only in the imperial period.

Nevertheless, some scholars – above all, Purcell and David – have attempted to establish, as far as possible, a set of general tendencies concerning the geographical origin of the *apparitores* at Rome. It must of course be borne in mind that the inscriptions analysed by these scholars cover a chronological span ranging from the second century BCE to the third century CE, and that the number of attestations increases markedly over time. Therefore, in the present state of our knowledge, it is impossible to arrive at a precise assessment of the situation for the Republican period only. These studies nevertheless remain useful and of interest for our purposes.

First, they allow us to note that in comparison with other categories of *apparitores* – for whom the epigraphic evidence seems to suggest a predominantly Roman origin – the category of the *scribae* appears

to display a markedly extra-urban provenance, more specifically from the regions of Latium and Campania. As Purcell has shown, the *scribae* were predominantly of Latin, rather than Greek, origin, with a significant proportion hailing from Campania [116]. Indeed, whereas the inscriptions known for the categories of *librarii*, *praecones*, *lictors* and *viatores* indicate, for roughly three quarters of the total, a connection with the city of Rome, in the case of the *scribae* the proportion of attestations originating from the city does not exceed fifty per cent [117].

It is clear that, in the absence of explicit evidence directly attesting the place of origin of the *scribae*, these hypotheses inevitably remain somewhat tentative. Still, the fact that the inscriptions – uniquely in the case of the *scribae* – display a particularly strong connection with the cities of Latium and Campania allows us to concur with David in concluding that their origins were not exclusively urban [118].

There is, therefore, a continuity between the historical and linguistic data concerning the non-urban – particularly South Italian – origin of the *scribae* and of the translators of official documents seen above: the information provided by documentary sources aligns with the inferences drawn from the linguistic analysis of proper name transcriptions, in which we frequently observe phono-orthographic features attributable to translators who were not native to the city of Rome, and who more often came from central and southern Italy, especially Campania.

As a corollary in support of this thesis, I would like to present here an additional piece of evidence, this time concerning the Greek translation of a term related to the Roman administrative sphere. I am referring to the use of the Greek σύγκλητος to translate the Latin *senatus* [119].

In all official documents produced during the Republican period, σύγκλητος is the standard and recurring translation of *senatus*. This was evidently a deliberate choice made in Rome, which persisted throughout the Republic and eventually spread in the East as well, to the point of becoming the standard Greek rendering of *senatus* in the eastern Mediterranean [120]. It is difficult to reconstruct the

[116] Purcell 1982, p. 160 (spec. n. 231), p. 162. More recently, Jean-Louis David has confirmed Purcell's findings by providing documentary evidence to show that: "the recruitment of *scribae* and their presence extended somewhat more broadly across the peninsula" (David 2019, p. 138).

[117] Cf. David 2019, p. 136.

[118] David 2019, p. 136.

[119] The relationship between these institutional terms and the Greek translation choices has been recently investigated

by Battistoni 2024, to whom I refer for further details on the matter.

[120] The earliest attestation of σύγκλητος referring to the Roman senate dates to a decree from Lampsacus, dated to 196 BCE (*I.Lampsakos* 4, l. 68). σύγκλητος was the preferred translation by Greek historians of the second century BCE; gradually, as the Augustan age neared, the term συγκλητός tended to be used less frequently, while the βουλή translation became increasingly common.

reason behind the chancellery's choice of σύγκλητος as the official translation: faced with the need to adapt the Latin *senatus* into Greek, one might have expected the choice of βουλή, the council *par excellence* in the Hellenic world. Moreover, in Greece, there are no attested instances —prior to Roman interventions—in which the term σύγκλητος is referred to an institution formally comparable to the Roman *senatus*. In Athens, for example, the term σύγκλητος, used in its participial function, designated an extraordinary assembly of the ἐκκλησία, convened outside the four regular sessions of the prytany [121]. Similarly, in the Achaean League, σύγκλητος referred to a supplementary assembly, distinct from the annual meetings (σύνοδοι) of the council and the general assembly [122]. In neither case does the term refer to a stable institutional council like the Roman Senate.

It is for this reason that we can support Mommsen's suggestion that the Roman model for σύγκλητος may have been drawn from institutions of Southern Italy. In that geographical area, the earliest attestation of the term dates to 242 BCE and is found in a decree from the city of Naples, where the sanctioning formula specifies that the decision was made by the σύγκλητος and ratified by the δῆμος [123]: σύγκλητος evidently referred to the city council, as it did in other cities of Magna Graecia [124].

A similar line of reasoning can be applied to the term δήμαρχος (translating the latin *tribunus plebis*) [125]. In this case too, Mommsen already identified Naples as the territory from which Rome would have borrowed the institutional term: in Greece, documentary sources attest that the δήμαρχος was a magistrate with judicial or religious functions; even in this case, we are not dealing with institutional roles that are directly comparable to the *tribunus plebis* in Rome [126].

The borrowing of σύγκλητος and δήμαρχος from the Campanian area—or more generally from Southern Italy – could perhaps be explained by the fact that the first translators of official Roman documents came from that geographical region. In this case, of course, it is difficult to go beyond mere hypothesising, but if

we admit this possibility, then the adoption of this terminology could be explained by the translators' familiarity with the institutions of southern Italy.

CONCLUSIONS

Roman official documents in Greek offer a uniquely revealing lens through which to examine the identity of the translators involved and a useful *corpus* to analyse the first attempts of the Romans to render their proper names into Greek. Even though the spellings of the names are not always phonetic transcriptions, we can find cases of transgraphemization in which the linguistic evidence demonstrates the persistence of phonetic, orthographic, and morphological patterns pointing to translators who were not native Greek speakers, but rather Latin-speaking individuals. In many cases, the transcription points out phono-graphemic tendencies specific to people from central and southern Italy. These findings closely align with the historical data on the origin of *scribae*. They constituted a formally recognised civic order, whose members, though often of modest or socially marginal background and frequently freeborn, enjoyed a legally acknowledged honorific status and privileged access to administrative and juridical expertise. From a geographical perspective, the available epigraphic evidence, albeit fragmentary and chronologically uneven, indicates that *scribae*, unlike other categories of *apparitores*, were not recruited exclusively in the urban population of Rome, and in fact often came from outside urban areas, especially Latium and Campania, and were predominantly of Latin rather than Greek origin. The convergence of linguistic and historical data supports the hypothesis that these *scribae* were the primary agents responsible for the translation of Latin documents into Greek. Ultimately, these translations—far from being mere mechanical transpositions—embody the complex cultural negotiations at play in the multilingual and multicultural reality of the Roman Empire. ■

[121] Cf. Aeschin. 2, 72; Dem. 18, 37, 6; 19, 123, 1. On the debated question of how the extraordinary character of the Athenian assembly should be understood, see Harris 1986 and Hansen 1987.

[122] Cf. IG VII 411. On the matter, see Rhodes, Lewis 1997, p. 107, p. 481, p. 491. Arena 2019, p. 11 also associates this extraordinary character of convocation with the συνκλεῖς of Larissa (IG IX 2 517).

[123] SEG XII 378, 7-8: ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀρχουσι καὶ τῇ[ι] συνκλήτῳ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ.

[124] Σύγκλητος as referring to the city council is attested in inscriptions (dated to 3rd–2nd century BCE) from Malta (IGUR 3, II 7-8), Agrigentum (I.Sicily 030279, I 10) and Kale Akte in Sicily (Cf. Arena 2019).

[125] The earliest attestation of this translation dates to 196 BCE (RDGE 34, 3).

[126] Cf. Battistoni 2024, p. 143-146.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

- ADAMIK, Béla, 2006**, « Offizielles Kommunikationssystem und Romanisierung », in Carmen Arias Abellán (ed.), *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif VII: Actes du VII^{ème} Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Séville, 2–6 septembre 2003*, Siviglia, p. 17-30.
- ADAMS, James Noel, 1975**, « The Latin of the Vindolanda Writing Tablets », *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 22, p. 20–24.
- ADAMS, James Noel, 1977**, *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters of Claudius Terentianus*, Manchester.
- ADAMS, James Noel, 2002**, « Bilingualism at Delos » in Adams, James Noel, Mark Janse, and Simon Swain, (ed.), *Bilingualism in ancient society: Language contact and the written text*, New York, p. 103-125.
- ADAMS, James Noel, 2003**, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge.
- ADAMS, James Noel, 2003a**, « The New Vindolanda Writing-Tablets », *Classical Quarterly* 53, p. 530–575.
- ADAMS, James Noel, 2007**, *The regional diversification of Latin, 200 BC-AD 600*, Cambridge.
- ADAMS, James Noel, 2013**, *Social variation and the Latin language*, Cambridge.
- ADAMS, James Noel, 2016**, *An Anthology Of Informal Latin, 200 BC – AD 900*, Cambridge.
- ALLEN, William Sidney, 1970²**, *Vox Latina*, Cambridge.
- ANDERSON, Roger Dean, PARSONS, Peter John & NISBET, Robert George Murdoch, 1979**, « Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaşr Ibrîm », *Journal of Roman Studies* 69, p. 125-155.
- ANGIUS, Andrea, 2016**, « Le attività amministrative », in Arnaldo Marcone (ed.), *Storia del lavoro in Italia. I. L'età romana*, Roma, p. 406-424.
- ARENA, Emiliano, 2009**, « Una nuova evidenza di sigle "demotiche" e di synkletos dalla Sicilia tardoellenistica: SEG LIX.1102 », *Studi di Antichità* 15, p. 7-41.
- BADIAN, Ernst, 1989**, « The *scribae* of the Roman republic », *Klio*, 71, p. 582-603.
- BAGLIONI, Daniele & TRIBULATO, Olga, 2015**, « Contatti di lingue – Contatti di scritture: considerazioni introduttive », Daniele Baglioni, Olga Tribulato (ed.), *Contatti di lingue – Contatti di scritture. Multilinguismo e multigrafismo dal Vicino Oriente Antico alla Cina contemporanea*, Venezia, p. 9-40.
- BATTISTONI, Filippo, 2024**, « Senatus – σύγκλητος: rapporto genetico o linguistico? », in Andrea Raggi (ed.), *Il lessico Greco dell'amministrazione romana*, Pisa, p. 141-156.
- BIVILLE, Frédérique, 2005**, « La "traductibilité" des noms propres dans le cadre du bilinguisme gréco-latin », *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 9.1, p. 209-218.
- BUCK, Carl Darling, 1904**, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*, Boston.
- CAPPONI, Mattia, 2024**, « Negli uffici dei traduttori: alcune riflessioni sulla traduzione in greco dei documenti ufficiali romani tra repubblica e principato augusteo », in Andrea Raggi (ed.), *Il lessico greco dell'amministrazione romana*, Pisa, p. 157-178.
- CHIRIKBA, Viacheslav, 2008**, « The problem of the Caucasian Sprachbund », in Pieter Muysken (ed.), *From Linguistic Areas to Areal Linguistics*, Amsterdam, p. 25-93.
- CONSANI, Carlo, 2016**, « The Greek of Italy between archaism, internal evolution and contact phenomena » *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 21.2, p. 99-115.
- COOLEY, Alison, 2012**, « From document to document: inscribing Roman official documents in the Greek East » in John Davies, John Wilkes (ed.) *Epigraphy and the Historical Sciences*. Oxford, p. 159-182.
- CORBIER, Mireille, 2008**, « Rome, un empire bilingue », in Laurence Villard (éd.), *Langues dominantes, langues dominées*, Rouen, p. 29-55.
- COUDRY, Marianne, 1989**, *Le Sénat de la République romaine de la guerre d'Hannibal à Auguste : pratiques délibératives et prise de décision*, Rome.
- DAVID, Jean-Michel, 2019**, *Au service de l'honneur. Les appariteurs de magistrats romains*, Paris.
- DE MADDALENA, Linda, 2014**, « Liberti scribes », *Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquité*, 61, p. 131-147.
- DOBIAS-LALOU, Catherine, 1998**, « Sur quelques noms latins en Cyrénaïque », in Bruno Bureau, Christian Nicholas, Hubert Zehnacker (éd.), *Moussylanea : mélanges de linguistique et de littérature anciennes offerts à Claude Moussy*, Paris, p. 206-212.
- DUBUISSON, Michael, 1982**, « Y a-t-il une politique linguistique romaine ? », *Ktèma* 7, p. 187-210.
- ECKINGER, Theodor, 1892**, *Die Orthographie lateinischer Wörter in griechischen Inschriften*, München.

- ESTÁRÁN TOLOSA, Maria José, 2025**, « Culture écrite et évolutions locales dans les régions osque et messapienne (du ^{ve} siècle au I^{er} siècle av. J.-C) », in Emmanuel Dupraz, Antoine Viredaz (éd.), *Langues et institutions en Italie méridionale*, Göttingen, p. 49-76.
- FAMERIE, Étienne, 2016**, « Les documents officiels romains d'époque républicaine et du Principat d'Auguste », in Pierangelo Buongiorno (ed.), *Texte regenerieren, Kontexte rekonstruieren*, Münster.
- FERRARY, Jean-Louis, 1988**, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*, Rome.
- FIGURETTI, Paolo, 2019**, « *Scribae*. Riflessioni sulla cultura scritta nella Roma antica », in D. Bianconi (ed.), *Storia della scrittura e altre storie*, Roma, p. 337-362.
- FLOBERT, Pierre, 1995**, « Le latin des tablettes de Murécine (Pompéi) », *Revue des études latines* 73, p. 138-150.
- GARCÍA DOMINGO, Enrique, 1979**, *Latinismos En La Koiné: (en Los Documentos Epigráficos Desde El 212 A. J.C. Hasta El 14 D. J.C.) Gramática Y Léxico Griego-latino, Latino-griego*, Burgos.
- GIGNAC, Francis Thomas, 1979**, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, I. (Phonology)*, Milan.
- HANSEN, Mogens, 1987**, *The Athenian Assembly*, Oxford.
- HARRIS, Edward, 1986**, « How often did the Athenian Assembly meet? », *Classical Quarterly* 36, p. 363-377.
- HARTMANN, Benjamin, 2020**, *The scribes of Rome: a cultural and social history of the « scribae »*, Cambridge – New York.
- KAIMIO, Jorma, 1979**, *The Romans and the Greek Language*, Helsinki.
- LAZZERONI, Romano, 1956**, « La "geminatio vocalium" nelle iscrizioni latine », *Annali della Scuola Normale di Pisa* 25, p. 124-135.
- MILLAR, Fergus, 1964**, « The Aerarium and Its Officials under the Empire », *The Journal of Roman Studies* 54, p. 33-40.
- MULLEN, Alex, 2011**, « Latin and Other Languages: Societal and Individual Bilingualism », in James Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*, Oxford, p. 527-548.
- ORIOLES, Vincenzo, 1972**, « Su alcuni fenomeni di palatalizzazione e di assibillazione nelle lingue dell'Italia antica », *Studi linguistici salentini* 5.1, p. 59-100.
- NIEDERMANN, Max, 1953²**, *Phonétique historique du latin*, Paris [1^{re} éd. 1948].
- PISANI, Vittore, 1954**, « Palatalizzazioni osche e latine », *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 39, p. 112-119.
- PELGROM, Jeremia, STEK, Tesse, 2015**, « Roman Colonization under the Republic: historiographical contextualisation of a paradigm, in Pelgrom Jeremia, Stek Tesse (ed.), *Roman Republican Colonization: new perspectives from archaeology and ancient history*, Rome, p. 11-41.
- PENNEY, John, 2011**, « Archaic and Old Latin », in James Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*, Oxford, p. 220-235.
- POCCETTI, Paolo, 2015**, « Morire lontano dall'Italia: differenze e interazioni attraverso l'epigrafia ellenistica della necropoli dell'isola di Renea (Delo) », in Marie-Laurence Haack (éd.), *L'écriture et l'espace de la mort. Épigraphie et nécropoles à l'époque préromaine*, Rome.
- PRUNELLE, Gérald, 1995**, *Les usages des graveurs dans la notation d'upsilon et des phonèmes aspirés*, Genève.
- PURCELL, Nicholas, 1983**, « The Apparitores: A Study in Social Mobility », *Papers of the British School at Rome* 51, p. 125-173.
- PURCELL, Nicholas, 2001**, « The "ordo scribarum": a study in the loss of memory, *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome – Antiquité*, 113.2, p. 633-674.
- RAGGI, Andrea & BUONGIORNO, Pierangelo, 2020**, « Il "senatus consultum de Plarasensibus et Aphrodisiensibus" del 39 a.C. Edizione, traduzione e commento », Stuttgart.
- RENTI, Lorenzo, 1970**, « Per la lingua dell'«Entrée d'Espagne» ». *Cultura neolatina* 30, p. 49-57.
- RHODES, Peter John & LEWIS, David, 1997**, *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford.
- ROCHETTE, Bruno, 1997**, *Le latin dans le monde grec. Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'empire romain*, Bruxelles.
- ROMAINE, Suzanne, 1994**, *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, Oxford.
- ROVAI, Francesco, 2015**, « The Greek transliteration of Latin names », *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 53.2, p. 163-185.
- ROVAI, Francesco, 2023**, « Recensione a N. Zair, Orthographic Traditions and the Sub-elite in the Roman Empire », *Studi e saggi linguistici* 61.2, p. 209-219.
- SHERK, Robert Kenneth, 1969**, *Roman Documents from the Greek East: Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus*, Baltimore.
- SCHULZ, Fritz, 1946**, *History of Roman legal science*, Oxford.
- SOMMER, Felix, 1948**, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut-und Formenlehre*, Heidelberg.

- STURTEVANT, Edgar, 1975²**, [1st ed. 1940] *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*, Chicago.
- TEODORSSON, Sven-Tage, 1974**, *The phonemic system of the Attic dialect 400-340 B.C.*, Göteborg.
- THREATTE, Leslie, 1980**, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions, volume I. Phonology*, Berlin – New York.
- TRIBULATO, Olga, 2012**, « Siculi bilingues? Latin in the inscriptions of early Roman Sicily », in Olga Tribulato (ed.), *Language and linguistic contact in ancient Sicily*, New York, p. 291-325.
- TUCKER, R. Whitney, 1969**, « Chronology of Greek Sound Changes », *The American Journal of Philology*, 90. 1, p. 36-47.
- VÄNNÄNEN, Veikko, 2006⁴ [1963] [127]**, *Introduction au latin vulgaire*, Madrid.
- VIERECK, Paul, 1888**, *Sermo Graecus quo Senatus populusque Romanus magistratusque populi Romani usque ad Tiberii Caesaris aetatem in scriptis publicis usi sunt examinatur*, Göttingen.
- VINE, Brent, 1993**, *Studies in Archaic Latin Inscriptions*, Innsbruck.
- WACHTER, Rudolf, 1987**, *Altlateinische Inschriften, Sprachliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Dokumenten bis etwa 150 v. Chr.*, Bern.
- ZAIR, Nicholas, 2018**, « Languages of Ancient Italy », in Gary D. Farney, Guy Bradley (ed.), *The Peoples of Ancient Italy*, Boston-Berlin.

[127] 1^{ère} edition 1963

Latin	Greek	Category	References [128]
Acilius	Ἀκίλιος		2.4; 16.12
Acūtius	Ἀκουτίος	I	24B43
Aemilius	Αἰμίλιος	VII	22.1, 24, 28
Aemīlius	Αἴμυλος	VII; VIII	14.10
Aenobarbus	Αἰνοβάρβος		IG, IX 2, 1 ² . 242. 3
Afīnius	Ἀφεΐνιος	IV	12.34
Albius	Ἄλβιος		12.27
Annius	Ἄννιος		10.B4; 12.26; 23.11
Antonius	Ἀντώνιος		RS 36.12
Antīstius	Ἀνθέστιος	VI	12.32, 46
Appūleius	Ἀππολήιος	VI	12.34
Asinius	Ἀσίνιος		26B40
Atinius	Ἀτίνιος		1.C3; 27.10
Aufidius	Αὐφίδιος		12.45
Aufidius	Ὠφίδιος	IX	4.18
Aulus	Αὔλος		2.42; 9. 8,13, 67; 16.12; 23.13; RS 22.37
Aurelius	Αὐρήλιος		23.4
Axius	Ἄξιος		23.12
Balbus	Βάλβος		29.6
Blasio	Βλασίων		4.1
Caecilius	Καικίλιος	VII	12.23
Caldus	Κάλδος		IG, IX 2, 1 ² . 242. 2
Calvinus	Καλουίνος	II	IKnidos 33, 4
Calvisius	Καλουΐσιος	II	31.74, 84
Camilia	Καμέλλια	XII	10B3,
Camilia	Καμίλλια	XII	RS 36. 6
Camilia	Καμιλία		15.4
Capito	Κάπιτων		RS 36. 3
Carvilius	Καρουίλιος	II	12.32
Cascellius	Κασκέλλιος		23.13
Cassius	Κάσιος	XIII	23.1, 8, 63
Cato	Κάτων		RS 12. III. 5
Catulus	Κάτλος	XVI	22.1, 3, 5, 24, 28
Censorinus	Κησωρίνος	XIV	27.3, 12
Censorinus	Κησωνρίνος		26C12
Cicero	Κικέρων		23.11
Calpurnius	Καλοπούρνιος	XV	14.59, 69, 86, 89
Claudia	Κλαύδια		23.62
Claudius	Κλαύδιος		2.15; 5.21; 23.6, 7, 16
Cloelius	Κλοέλιος		27.8
Clustumina	Κλυτομίνα	XIV	23.11
Coelius	Κούλιος	XVII	IG, IX 2, 1 ² . 242. 2
Cornelius	Κορνήλιος		4.1; 12.36; 15.21, 59; 20A1, E4, E14; 21. 1; 22.2; 23.20, 22, 26, 39

Crustūmina	Κρυστομίνα	VI	23.11
Didius	Δίδιος		12.31
Dīdus	Δείδιος	IV	RS 12 B28
Dolabella	Δολαβέλλα		21. 1
Domītius	Δομέτιος	VI	12.37, IG IX 2, 1 ² . 242. 3; IKnidos 33, 4
Erennius	Ἐρέννιος		12.40
Faberius	Φαβέριος		22.4
Fabia	Φάβια		24A11; 27.10
Fabius	Φάβιος		14.68
Fannius	Φάννιος		18.21
Fondanius	Φονδάνιος		18.22
Fonteiis	Φοντήιος		5.22
Fūlvius	Φόλουιος	II; IV	10.B2.13; 38.10
Fūrius	Φούριος	I	1.D1
Gabīnius	Γαβεΐνιος	IV	RS 22. 37
Gabīnus	Γαυείνιος	IV	24A11
Gaius	Γάιος		1.C3; 2.22, 52; 4.16, 19; 10.B4; 11.3, 11; 12.24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 40; 14.22, 23. 1, 11; 15.59; 18.21, 22; 22.4; 24A11; 26B40; 26C10, 16; 27.3, 5, 7, 9, 63; 29.9; IG, IX 2, 1 ² . 242. 2
Geminius	Γεμίνιος		RS 36. 7
Genucius	Γενύκιος		12.42
Gellius	Γέλλιος		IG, IX 2, 1 ² . 242. 5
Gessius	Γέσσιος		12.28
Glaber	Γλάβερ		23.7
Gnaeus	Γναῖος	VII	2.54; 4.16; 9.12; 10.B3, B6; 12.26, 33, 45; 15.59; 16A, 16; 21.1; 24A1; 25.1; IKnidos 33, 4
Hostilius	Ὅστίλιος		2.42; 9.8, 67
Iūnius	Ἰούνιος	I	26B42
Iūlius	Ἰούλιος	I	24A10; 26B23; RS 35. 3; RS 36.6
Laberius	Λαβέριος		12.40
Laelius	Λαΐλιος	VII	14.22, 23
Lemonia	Λεμωνία		2315, 16, 61
Lentulus	Λέντλος	XVI	24A1
Lepīdus	Λεπεδός	VI	24A1; 26B40, Mitchell 2005, 2
Licinius	Λικίνιος		3.2; 23.4, 8; 39.1
Licinius	Λικίννιος	XII	12.30; 13.6
Lollius	Λόλλιος		12.44
Lutatus	Λυτάτιος		22.1, 3, 5, 24, 28

[128] Unless otherwise indicated, references are to SHERK 1969 (*Roman Documents from the Greek East* = RDGE).

Lūcius	Λεύκιος	V	1.B1, D1; 2.54; 4.19; 10.B3, B4; 12.25, 28, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 34, 40, 42, 43, 46; 14.59, 69, 86, 89; 20A1, E4, E14; 23.10, 16; 22.4; 24.126B41; 27.6 3 12, 35.16; 29.5; 36.1; SEG 35, 823. 8
Lūcullus	Λευκόλλος	V	23.1; 39.1
Lūcilius	Λευκέλιος	IV; V	12.30
Lūcretius	Λοκρέτιος	VI	2.22, 52
Lūtātius	Λοτάτιος	VI	9.12
Maenius	Μαίνιος	VII	2.1; 10.38; 23.15, 61
Mallius	Μάλλιος		7.39; 16A16
Manius	Μάνιος		1.C2; 2.4 16; 5.22; 12.30; 23.15, 61; 24C8
Manlius	Μάνλιος		10B6; 16A16
Marcellinus	Μαρκέλλινος		24A1
Marcellus	Μαρκέλλος		23.6
Marius	Μάριος		RS 12. B20
Marcus	Μάρκος		14.10; 22.1, 24, 28; 23.3. 12; 26B37, B38, C1, C13, C27; ; 27.8; 29.4; 34.2; Mitchell 2005, 2; <i>Iknidos</i> 33, 4; RS 35.1; RS 12. III.4; RS 35.1
Maximus	Μάξιμος		32.4
Memmius	Μέμμιος		12.25
Menenia	Μενηνία		<i>IKnidos</i> 33, 4
Metellus	Μετέλλος		23.53
Minucius	Μίνυκιος		5.15
Mārcellus	Μααρκέλλος	XIX	23.6
Mārcus	Μάαρκος	XIX	2.15; 7.35, 49, 58, 61; 12.24, 27, 30, 34, 36, 38, 39; 23.1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 73; 24.2; 38.10
Mīnucius	Μυνύκιος	VIII	23.14
Mūcius	Μούκιος	I	2.15; 47.26
Nautius	Ναύτιος		12.35
Nonius	Νώνιος		27.6; 29.5
Norbanus	Νωρβάνος		26C10
Nūmisius	Νομίσιος	VI	2.5
Orbius	Όρβιος		35.16
Ofentina	Ωφεντίνια		27.10
Ofentīna	Ωφεντεΐνια	IV	29.6
Palatina	Παλατίνα		26C10
Papīria	Παπεΐρια	IV	12.43
Papiria	Παπίρια		15.6
Passienus	Πασσιήνος		2.54
Petillius	Πετίλλιος		22.5
Piso	Πίσων		15.33
Pīso	Πείσων	IV	RS 22.38
Plaetorius	Πλαΐτωριος	VII	12.43
Plautus	Πλαύτος		29.7
Pomentina	Πωμεντΐνα		23.8;
Pompeius	Πομπήιος		12.36; 23.12; 25.1; 29.1

Popilia	Ποπλίλια		22.4; 27.11
Popillius	Ποπίλλιος		2.1, 11; 21. 1; 27.6
Porcius	Πόρκιος		5.20; RS 12. III. 4
Postūmius	Ποστόμιος	VI	1.B1
Publicius	Ποπλίκιος	XVII	23.14
Pūrīnia	Πουπεινία	I; IV	12.29
Pūrius	Πούπιος	I	12.24
Pūblius	Πόπλιος	VI, XVII	2.15; 3.2; 4.1; 5.20; 8.1; 12.27, 28, 33, 37; 13.6; 15.6, 21; 16.6, 9, 15; 27.7, 10
Quintius	Κοίνκτιος	III	31.1; 9.52, 64
Quintus	Κοίντος	III	2.1, 10, 15, 38; 5.15; 9.11; 12.23, 31, 35, 40, 44; 14.68; 22.1, 3, 5, 24, 28; 23.12, 14, 53; 27.8; 24B43
Quirina	Κουρίνα	X	27.5, 8
Quirina	Κυρίνα	X	12.27; 23.13
Romilia	Ρωμιλία		23.13
Rūbrius	Ρούβριος	I	12.29; 16.12
Rūfus	Ροῦφος	I	23.12; <i>IKnidos</i> 33. 5
Rūtilius	Ροτίλιος	VI	16.6, 9, 15
Sabīnus	Σαβεΐνος	IV	31.74, 84
Scaurus	Σκαῦρος		15.4
Scipio	Σκιπίων		36.1
Sempronius	Σεμπρώνιος	XI	4.19
Sempronius	Σεμπρώνιος		9.13; 12.26; 26B41
Sentius	Σέντιος		<i>IG</i> , IX 2, 1 ² , 242. 3
Sergia	Σέργια		22.4
Servilius	Σεροΐλιος		27.8
Servilius	Σερουΐλιος	II	11.20; 25.12
Servius	Σέρουιος	II	10.B2, 13; 14.57, 65
Sextus	Σέξτος		29.1
Silanus	Σίλανος		26B37, B38, C1, C27
Sisenna	Σισέννα		15.59, 22.2
Spūrius	Σπόριος	VI	1.B1; 12.32
Statilienus	Στατιληνός		9.11
Stellatina	Στηλατΐνα	XIII	23.8
Sulla	Σύλλα		20A1, E4, E14; 23.20, 22, 26, 39
Sīlius	Σελίος	IV	12.33
Sūlpicius	Σολπίκιος	VI	14.57, 65
Taurus	Θῶρος	XIX	27.9
Teretina	Τηρητινᾶ		23.14
Terentius	Τερέντιος		23.1
Titus	Τίτος		2.1, 5; 4.18; 9.52, 64; 10, 7; 22.5; 27. 10; RS 12. B17, IV.8
Tremellius	Τρημήλιος	XIII	10B3
Tullius	Τύλλιος		23.11
Tīberius	Τεβέρος	VI	5.21
Valerius	Ουαλέ(α)ριος	II	34.2; RS 12. B20
Valgus	Ουαλγιος	II	12.25
Varro	Ουάρρων	II	23.1; 26B42
Velina	Ουελΐνα	II	<i>IKnidos</i> 33, 5
Veturia	Ουετύρια	II	12.35

Type of Document	Reference [129]	Year
Letter of M. Valerius Messalla (praetor) to Teos	34	193 BCE
Senatus Consultum on Delphic Privileges	1	189 BCE
Letter of C. Livius (Salinator) to Delphi	38	189–188 BCE
Letter of an unknown Licinius to the Amphictyons	39	186 BCE
Senatus Consultum on the Thisbeans	2	ca. 170 BCE
Senatus Consultum on Coronea	3	ca. 170 BCE
Letter of P. Cornelius Blasio and Senatus Consultum concerning the Ambraciots and the Athamanians	4	175–170 BCE
Treaty between Rome and Maronea	SEG 35, 823	167 BCE
Senatus Consultum on the Sarapeum at Delos	5	166–165 BCE
Senatus Consultum on the Prienians and Ariarathes	6	156 BCE
Letter of M. Aemilius and Senatus Consultum on disputes of Magnesia and Priene	7	mid-2nd c. BCE
Letter of P. Sextilius with a Senatus Consultum	8	2nd c. BCE?
Senatus Consultum on disputes of NARTHACIANS and Melitaeans	9	ca. 140 BCE
Senatus Consultum on disputes of Priene and Samos	10	135 BCE
Senatus Consultum Popillianum on Pergamum	11	133 BCE?
Senatus Consultum on the land of Pergamum	12	129 BCE?
Senatus Consultum on the reorganization of Phrygia	13	119/116 BCE?
Letter of L. Calpurnius Piso and Senatus consultum concerning the disputes of the Itani and the Hierapytnians	14	112 BCE
Senatus Consultum on the guilds of Dionysiac artists	15	112 BCE
Senatus Consultum and treaty between Rome and Astypalaia	16	105 BCE
<i>Lex de provinciis praetoriis</i>	RS 12	101 BCE
Treaty between Rome and Thyrraeum	IG, IX 2, 1 ² , 242	94 BCE
Senatus Consultum on Tabenis	17	81–80 BCE?
Senatus Consultum on the Stratoniceans	18	81 BCE
Senatus Consultum on the Cormii	19	80 BCE?
Letter of L. Cornelius Sulla with Senatus Consultum on Thasos	20	80 BCE
Senatus Consultum on Asclepiades	22	73 BCE
Senatus Consultum and related acts on the disputes of Oropus and the <i>publicani</i>	23	73 BCE
Letter of Cn. Cornelius Dolabella	21	69–68 BCE
<i>Lex Gabinia</i>	RS 22	58 BCE
Senatus Consultum on the Issaeans	24	56 BCE
Senatus Consultum on the lands of Mytilene	25	55 BCE
Letters and Senatus Consulta concerning the Mytilenaeans	26	Age of Caesar?
Treaty between Rome and the Lycian League	Mitchell 2005	46 BCE
Treaty between Rome and Knidos	IKnidos 33	45 BCE
Fragment of a Law from Ephesos	RS 35	45 BCE
Senatus Consultum on Panamara	27	39 BCE
Letter of Mark Antony to Plarasa and Aphrodisias with Senatus Consultum	28	39–35 BCE
<i>Lex Fonteia</i>	RS 36	39–33 BCE

[129] Unless otherwise indicated, references are to Sherk 1969 (*Roman Documents from the Greek East* = RDGE).